

I know that Bonnie Palecek will be sorely missed by all who have known her dedication to serving victims of sexual and domestic violence. I offer her my congratulations and best wishes for her continued success and happiness in the coming years.

LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL (NAAG) OPPOSING H.R. 2046, THE "INTERNET GAMBLING REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2007"

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 19, 2007

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) signed by 45 Attorneys General opposing Representative BARNEY FRANK's legislation, H.R. 2046, the "Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007." In this letter, these Attorneys General declare that the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006, which provided an additional Federal enforcement tool against Internet gambling and which was signed into law last year, has "effectively driven many illicit gambling operators from the American marketplace." The NAAG letter then goes on to detail the opposition of 45 top law enforcement officials to H.R. 2046. I request that the entirety of this letter be included in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, including the list of all the signers of this letter.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL,

Washington, DC, November 30, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate
Washington, DC.

TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE: We, the Attorneys General of our respective States, have grave concerns about H.R. 2046, the "Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007." We believe that the bill would undermine States' traditional powers to make and enforce their own gambling laws.

On March 21, 2006, 49 NAAG members wrote to the leadership of Congress: "We encourage the United States Congress to help combat the skirting of state gambling regulations by enacting legislation which would address Internet gambling, while at the same time ensuring that the authority to set overall gambling regulations and policy remains where it has traditionally been most effective: at the state level." Congress responded by enacting the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006, UIGEA, which has effectively driven many illicit gambling operators from the American marketplace.

But now, less than a year later, H.R. 2046 proposes to do the opposite, by replacing state regulations with a Federal licensing program that would permit Internet gambling companies to do business with U.S.

customers. The Department of the Treasury would alone decide who would receive Federal licenses and whether the licensees were complying with their terms. This would represent the first time in history that the Federal government would be responsible for issuing gambling licenses.

A Federal license would supersede any state enforcement action, because §5387 in H.R. 2046 would grant an affirmative defense against any prosecution or enforcement action under any Federal or State law to any person who possesses a valid license and complies with the requirements of H.R. 2046. This divestment of state gambling enforcement power is sweeping and unprecedented.

The bill would legalize Internet gambling in each State, unless the Governor clearly specifies existing state restrictions barring Internet gambling in whole or in part. On that basis, a State may "opt out" of legalization for all Internet gambling or certain types of gambling. However, the opt-out for types of gambling does not clearly preserve the right of States to place conditions on legal types of gambling. Thus, for example, if the State permits poker in licensed card rooms, but only between 10 a.m. and midnight, and the amount wagered cannot exceed \$100 per day and the participants must be 21 or older, the Federal law might nevertheless allow 18-year-olds in that State to wager much larger amounts on poker around the clock.

Furthermore, the opt-outs may prove illusory. They will likely be challenged before the World Trade Organization. The World Trade Organization has already shown itself to be hostile to U.S. restrictions on Internet gambling. If it strikes down State opt-outs as unduly restrictive of trade, the way will be open to the greatest expansion of legalized gambling in American history and near total preemption of State laws restricting Internet gambling.

H.R. 2046 effectively nationalizes America's gambling laws on the Internet, "harmonizing" the law for the benefit of foreign gambling operations that were defying our laws for years, at least until UIGEA was enacted. We therefore oppose this proposal, and any other proposal that hinders the right of States to prohibit or regulate gambling by their residents.

Sincerely,

John S. Juthers, Attorney General of Colorado; Bill McCollum, Attorney General of Florida; Douglas Gansler, Attorney General of Maryland; Troy King, Attorney General of Alabama; Talis J. Colberg, Attorney General of Alaska; Terry Goddard, Attorney General of Arizona; Dustin McDaniel, Attorney General of Arkansas; Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Attorney General of California; Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of Connecticut; Joseph R. (Beau) Biden III, Attorney General of Delaware.

Linda Singer, Attorney General of the District of Columbia; Thurbert E. Baker, Attorney General of Georgia; Alicia G. Limtiaco, Attorney General of Guam; Mark J. Bennett, Attorney General of Hawaii; Lawrence Wasden, Attorney General of Idaho; Lisa Madigan, Attorney General of Illinois; Stephen Carter, Attorney General of Indiana; Paul Morrison, Attorney General of Kansas; Charles C. Foti, Jr., Attorney General of Louisiana; G. Steven Rowe, Attorney General of Maine.

Lori Swanson, Attorney General of Minnesota; Jim Hood, Attorney General of Mississippi; Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Attorney General of Missouri; Mike McGrath, Attorney General of Montana; Kelly A. Ayotte, Attorney Gen-

eral of New Hampshire; Anne Milgram, Attorney General of New Jersey; Gary King, Attorney General of New Mexico; Roy Cooper, Attorney General of North Carolina; Wayne Stenehjem, Attorney General of North Dakota; Marc Dann, Attorney General of Ohio.

W.A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General of Oklahoma; Hardy Myers, Attorney General of Oregon; Tom Corbett, Attorney General of Pennsylvania; Patrick C. Lynch, Attorney General of Rhode Island; Henry McMaster, Attorney General of South Carolina; Larry Long, Attorney General of South Dakota; Robert E. Cooper, Jr., Attorney General of Tennessee; Greg Abbott, Attorney General of Texas; Mark Shurtleff, Attorney General of Utah; William H. Sorrell, Attorney General of Vermont. Robert McDonnell, Attorney General of Virginia; Rob McKenna, Attorney General of Washington; Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., Attorney General of West Virginia; J.B. Van Hollen, Attorney General of Wisconsin; Bruce A. Salzberg, Attorney General of Wyoming.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND
SECURITY ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 18, 2007

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Renewable Fuels, Consumer Protection, and Energy Efficiency Act of 2007. It is an initial step towards a new energy policy. Some will say this bill goes too far, others will claim it does not go far enough. While opportunities to overhaul our energy policy were missed, this bill does include a starting point for true reform.

Any attempt to transform the direction of our energy policy must include an increase in CAFE standards. Increasing fuel efficiency is something I have fought many years for. We have the technology to do it, we have the will to do it and now, with this bill, we have made the commitment to do it. This provision is the cornerstone for revamping our energy policy. It not only addresses our reliance on imported oil, but will also help stem the creation of green house gasses.

I agree with the inclusion of a Renewable Fuels Standard; however, as we have learned over the past few years, the manner in which it is executed raises its own set of questions. Our current thirst is for corn based ethanol. Of 5 billion gallons of biofuels produced domestically last year, 4.9 billion were derived from corn. Placing a limit on the amount of corn ethanol eligible to be applied in meeting the RFS is a necessary step. Yet, I have doubts as to whether that limit is too high and whether more should be done to ensure the development of other biofuels. Also, most studies give corn based ethanol an energy balance of 1.2. Would it not be a better long term policy to shift our focus towards a more efficient source of biofuel?

Finally, I am concerned about the effects this mandate could have on the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay Task Force and I have worked tirelessly to clean up this troubled waterway. Spurred on by government subsidies, farmers in the watershed have been drastically increasing their corn acreage. Due